

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-29. Claims 1, 10 and 16 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

ABSTRACT OBJECTION

The abstract was objected to under MPEP 608.01(b) in paragraph 1 of the Office Action because the abstract was more than 150 words long. In response to this objection, the abstract was amended to be less than 150 words long. Therefore, it is believed that this objection has been overcome.

DISCLOSURE OBJECTION

The disclosure was objected to in paragraph 2 of the Office Action because of informalities. In response to this objection, the disclosure has been amended to correct the cited informalities. Therefore, it is believed that this objection has been overcome.

TRADEMARK OBJECTION

The disclosure was objected to in paragraph 3 of the Office Action due to incorrect use of trademarks. In response to this objection, the disclosure has been amended to use proper trademarks. Therefore, it is believed that this objection has been overcome.

COPYRIGHT OBJECTION

The disclosure was objected to in paragraph 4 of the Office Action due to improper use of a copyright notice. In response to this objection, the disclosure has been amended

to use proper copyright notice. Therefore, it is believed that this objection has been overcome.

DRAWING OBJECTION

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) in paragraph 5 of the Office Action because the drawings include reference signs not mentioned in the description. In response to this objection, the disclosure has been amended to describe these reference signs. Therefore, it is believed that this objection has been overcome.

STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP

The Examiner is respectfully directed to MPEP 706.02(l)(1) and MPEP 706.02(l)(2).

The application Serial No. 10/047,213 (referred to hereinafter as "Arnold") and the cited prior art U.S. Patent No. 6,593,944 B1 (referred to hereinafter as "Nicolas") were, at the time the invention of Arnold was made, was subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nicolas. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3 and 16-19 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas.

Currently amended independent Claim 1 recites:

A hand-held computer device, comprising:

 a processor, forming a part of the handheld computer;
 a display coupled to the processor forming a part of the handheld computer,
 the display having resolution of MxN pixels;

a browser program running on the processor that facilitates retrieving and viewing of a web page on the display, the web page having a size greater than $M \times N$; the browser having associated program code for transcoding the web page to a format adapted to the display by generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections.

Claim 1 recites that “generating a menu of frames from the web page” permits “a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections.” The cited reference fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation as discussed below.

For example, at col. 11 lines 24-30, Nicolas teaches,

... the small-sized electronic display device of the personal digital assistant does not have sufficient display area to view all the frames of a web page at once when a user is Web browsing. The present invention overcomes this limitation (1) by generating a frame representation which indicates the frame layout of the Web page ...

Further, at col. 11, line 45 to col. 13, line 11, Nicolas teaches,

The frame representation 730 includes a plurality of geometric frame identifiers 731A-731C. ... In one embodiment, the shape, size, and positioning of the geometric frame identifiers 731A-731C are based on the size, shape, and positioning of the corresponding frame, including the content of the corresponding frame.

Note, Nicolas teaches, overcoming the size limitation of a display device by generating a frame representation that includes a plurality of geometric frame identifiers the shape, size, and positioning of which are based on the size, shape, and positioning of the frame.

Thus, Nicolas does not teach or suggest “generating a menu of frames from the web page” which permits “a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections,” as Claim 1 recites.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 2 and 3 depend on Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 2 and 3 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

Currently amended independent Claim 16 recites:

A method of transcoding a web page within a hand-held computer device with display having resolution of MxN, comprising:
determining if the web page contains multiple frames; and
if the web page contains multiple frames, generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections.

Claim 16 recites that “generating a menu of frames from the web page” permits “a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections.” The cited reference fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation as discussed below.

As already argued herein, Nicolas does not teach or suggest “generating a menu of frames from the web page” which permits “a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections,” as Claim 16 recites.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 16 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas. As such, allowance of Claim 16 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 17-19 depend on Claim 16, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 17-19 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Buckley et al., U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 2003/0135649 A1 (referred to hereinafter as "Buckley"). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 20 and 21 are neither taught nor suggested by Buckley.

Currently independent Claim 20 recites:

A method of transcoding a web page within a hand-held computer device with display having resolution of MxN, comprising:
determining if the web page contains an image; and
if the web page contains an image, compressing the image to a size suitable for display on the MxN resolution display.

Claim 20 recites a method of transcoding a web page within a hand-held computer device that compresses, "...the image to a size suitable for display on the MxN resolution display." The cited reference fails to teach or suggest these claimed limitations as discussed below.

For example, in the abstract, Buckley teaches, "...a method by which a client side handheld device requests a server to convert server-side documents into a compression format prior to transmission of said documents to the client." Further, Buckley teaches in paragraph 5 that the reasons for compressing on the server is to take advantage of the computing power of the server and to speed up transmission.

Thus, Buckley does not teach a method of transcoding a web page within a hand-held computer device that compresses, "...the image to a size suitable for display on the MxN resolution display," as Claim 20 recites. In fact, Buckley teaches away from compressing within a hand-held computer device. For the foregoing rationale, the

limitations of Claim 20 are neither taught nor suggested by Buckley. As such, allowance of Claim 20 is respectfully solicited.

Claim 21 depends on Claim 20, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claim 20 has been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Robotham, U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 2002/0015042 A1 (referred to hereinafter as "Robotham"). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 20 and 21 are neither taught nor suggested by Robotham.

Currently independent Claim 20 recites:

A method of transcoding a web page within a hand-held computer device with display having resolution of MxN, comprising:
determining if the web page contains an image; and
if the web page contains an image, compressing the image to a size suitable for display on the MxN resolution display.

Claim 20 recites "if the web page contains an image, compressing the image to a size suitable for display on the MxN resolution display." The cited reference fails to teach or suggest these claimed limitations as discussed below.

For example, in the abstract, Robotham teaches a method of displaying content on client devices that minimizes the processing on the client device by performing server-side "rasterization" of the content prior to transmitting the content to the client devices. In paragraph 4, Robotham defines "rasterization" as, "...generating a displayable bitmap image from input data."

Further, in paragraphs 26-28, a user of the client may instruct the server as to what content they are interested in seeing and the server may rasterize the content based on the client's instructions.

Thus, Robatham does not teach "if the web page contains an image, compressing the image to a size suitable for display on the MxN resolution display," as Claim 20 recites. For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 20 are neither taught nor suggested by Robatham. As such, allowance of Claim 20 is respectfully solicited.

Claim 21 depends on Claim 20, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claim 20 has been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Farouk, U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 2003/0009567 A1 (referred to hereinafter as "Farouk"). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 25 and 26 are neither taught nor suggested by Farouk.

Currently independent Claim 25 recites:

A method of transcoding a web page within a hand-held computer device with display having resolution of MxN, comprising
determining if the web page contains multiple columns; and
if the web page contains multiple columns, converting the multiple columns into a single column for display on the MxN resolution display.

Claim 25 recites “if the web page contains multiple columns, converting the multiple columns into a single column for display on the MxN resolution display.” The cited reference fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation as discussed below.

For example, at paragraph 39, Farouk teaches a method of adapting content obtained from the Internet to conform to many different types of terminal devices, such as PCs, desktop terminals, cell phones, and Personal Data Assistants (PDAs) by defining an abstract, generic terminal device, “in terms of a set of discrete values of a plurality of selected terminal device features to provide an approximate representation of any user network terminal device...”

As referenced above, Claim 25 recites “if the web page contains multiple columns, converting the multiple columns into a single column for display on the MxN resolution display.” As understood by Applicant, the only places that Farouk mentions “column” is in the following passages: In paragraph 0110, Farouk states, “As with <columns>, below, concatenation of segments is supported.” In paragraph 0111, Farouk states, “As indicated in the DVIML elements 165, the content author 11 may use the <columns> element in order to specify alternatives to provide for devices which are horizontally restricted.” In paragraph 0112, Farouk states, “Here again as with rows and columns, the content author 11 may use concatenation of segments in order to avoid repeating the same content in different segments.” Importantly, Farouk does not teach or suggest, converting multiple columns into a single column in any of these above passages let alone teach or suggest “if the web page contains multiple columns, converting the multiple columns into a single column for display on the MxN resolution display,” as Claim 25 recites.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 25 are neither taught nor suggested by Farouk. As such, allowance of Claim 25 is respectfully solicited.

Claim 26 depends on Claim 25, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claim 26 has been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas in view of Robotham. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 4 and 5 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas, or Robotham, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Robotham does not teach or suggest Claims 1 upon which Claims 4 and 5 depend. In fact the Office Action does not claim that Robotham teaches or suggests Claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 4 and 5 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas in view of Farouk. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 6 and 7 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas, or Robotham, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Farouk does not teach or suggest Claims 1 upon which Claims 6 and 7 depend. In fact the Office Action does not claim that Farouk teaches or suggests Claim 1.

Claims 6 and 7 depend on Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 6 and 7 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas in view of Buckley and Farouk. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas, Buckley, or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Buckley does not teach or suggest Claim 1 upon which Claim 8 depends. In fact the Office Action does not claim that Buckley teaches or suggests Claim 1.

Further, the cited combination also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 because Farouk fails to remedy the deficiency in Buckley in that Farouk also fails to teach or suggest, "generating a menu of frames from the web page," which permits "a user to select a desired frame from display by selecting frame titles as menu selections," as recited by Claim 1.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 8 is neither taught nor suggested by Buckley or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Claim 8 depends on Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claim 8 has been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas in view of Robotham and Farouk. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas, Robotham, or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Robotham does not teach or suggest Claims 1 upon which Claim 8 depends. In fact the Office Action does not claim that Robotham teaches or suggests Claim 1.

Further, the cited combination also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 because Farouk fails to remedy the deficiency in Robotham in that Farouk also fails to teach or suggest, "generating a menu of frames from the web page," which permits "a user to select a desired frame from display by selecting frame titles as menu selections," as recited by Claim 1.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 8 are neither taught nor suggested by Buckley or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Claim 8 depends on Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claim 8 has been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas further in view of Buckley and Farouk. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 9-15 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas, Buckley or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Currently independent Claim 9 recites, “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections.” The cited references fail to teach or suggest these claimed limitations as discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Buckley does not teach or suggest “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections,” as Claims 9 recites. In fact the Office Action does not claim that Buckley teaches or suggests “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections.” Therefore, it is believed that Buckley fails to teach or suggest Claim 9.

Further, the cited combination also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 9 because Farouk fails to remedy the deficiency in Buckley in that Farouk also fails to teach or suggest, “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections,” as recited by Claim 9.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 9 are neither taught nor suggested by Buckley or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Claims 10-15 depend on Claim 9, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 10-15 have been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas further in view of Robotham and Farouk. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 9-15 are neither taught nor suggested by Nicolas, Robotham or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Currently independent Claim 9 recites, “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections.” The cited references fail to teach or suggest these claimed limitations as discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Robotham does not teach or suggest “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections,” as Claims 9 recites. In fact the Office Action does not claim that Robotham teaches or suggests “generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections.” Therefore, it is believed that Robotham fails to teach or suggest Claim 9.

Further, the cited combination also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 9 because Farouk fails to remedy the deficiency in Robotham in that Farouk also fails to teach or suggest, "generating a menu of frames from the web page to permit a user to select a desired frame for display by selecting frame titles as menu selections by selecting frame titles as menu selections," as recited by Claim 9.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 9 are neither taught nor suggested by Robotham or Farouk, alone or in combination.

Claims 10-15 depend on Claim 9, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 10-15 have been overcome and its allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley further in view of Nicolas. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 22-24 are neither taught nor suggested by Buckley or Nicolas, alone or in combination.

As already argued herein, Buckley does not teach or suggestion Claim 20 upon which Claims 22-24 depend.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the

invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Claims 22-24 depend on Claim 20, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 22-24 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham further in view of Nicolas. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 22-24 are neither taught nor suggested by Robotham or Nicolas, alone or in combination.

As already argued herein, Robotham does not teach or suggestion Claim 20 upon which Claims 22-24 depend.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Claims 22-24 depend on Claim 20, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 22-24 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Farouk further in view of Nicolas. The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 27-29 are neither taught nor suggested by Farouk or Nicolas, alone or in combination.

As already argued herein, Farouk does not teach or suggestion Claim 25 upon which Claims 27-29 depend.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Nicolas is disqualified as prior art. This application, application no. 20/047,213, and the Nicolas patent were, at the time the invention of this application was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same assignee.

Claims 27-29 depend on Claim 25, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejections of Claims 27-29 have been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: Feb 25, 2004

Cheryl A. Eichstaedt
Cheryl A. Eichstaedt
Registration No. 50,761

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile